

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed March 31, 2008, claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12 were rejected. Additionally, claims 4, 4/5, 4/6, 4/7, 11, and 11/12 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks. No claims are added. Applicant submits that the proposed amendments place the present application in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal.

For reference, proposed amendments are presented for claims 1, 5-8, and 12. In particular, the proposed amendment for claim 1 includes limitations related to the limitations previously recited in claims 2-4. Consequently, claims 2-4 are canceled. Additionally, proposed amendments are presented for claims 5-7 to amend the dependencies of these claims, accordingly. The proposed amendment for claim 8 includes limitations related to the limitations previously recited in claims 9-11. Consequently, claims 9-11 are canceled. Additionally, the proposed amendment presented for claim 12 amends the dependency of claim 12, accordingly.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review of the claims and determination that claims 4 and 11, as well as the combinations of claims 4/5, 4/6, 4/7, and 11/12, recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 4, 4/5, 4/6, 4/7, 11, and 11/12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Additionally, while the Office Action provides a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, the Office Action's statement is directed to specific aspects of certain claims and not necessarily all of the claims. Applicant notes that the Office Action's comments may have paraphrased the language of the claims and it should be understood that the language of the claims themselves set out the scope of the

claims. Thus, it is noted that the claim language should be viewed in light of the exact language of the claim rather than any paraphrasing or implied limitations thereof.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1-3, 5, and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rasinger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,365,246, hereinafter Rasinger). Additionally, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasinger in view of Isohatala et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,252,554, hereinafter Isohatala). Additionally, claims 7 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rasinger in view of Ella, Juha (U.S. Pat. No. 6,278,342, hereinafter Ella).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 8 are patentable over Rasinger, Isohatala, and Ella because independent claims 1 and 8 recite allowable subject matter, as recognized in the Office Action, previously recited in claims 4 and 11, respectfully. Claims 5-7 and 12 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts claims 1, 5-8, and 12 are allowable.

## CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: May 28, 2008

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111